



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,216	01/29/2004	Pamela R. Lipson	018236-001900US	2597

20350 7590 01/25/2008
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

KIM, PAUL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2161

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

mn

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/767,216	Applicant(s) LIPSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Paul Kim	Art Unit 2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 21-24 and 36-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 21-24 and 36-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is responsive to the following communication: Amendment filed on 31 October 2007.
2. Claims 1-5, 21-24, and 36-39 are pending and present for examination.

Response to Amendment

3. Claims 1-5 and 21-23 have been amended.
4. Claims 36-39 have been added.
5. Claims 25-35 and 40-42 have been cancelled.

Election/Restrictions

6. Newly submitted claims 43-68 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: As asserted by Applicant, newly submitted claims 43-49, 50-52, 53-59, and 60-68 are directed to four distinct separate groups of claims.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 43-68 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. **Claims 1-5 and 22-24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al, "Tools and techniques for color image retrieval" (NPL, hereinafter referred to as SMITH), published on March 1996 by Proc. SPIE Vol. 2670, p. 426-437, in view of Stubler et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,804,684, hereinafter referred to as STUBLER), filed on 7 May 2001, published on 12 December 2002, and issued on 12 October 2004.

9. **As per independent claims 1 and 22**, SMITH, in combination with STUBLER, discloses:

An image processing system for searching images on a network, the image process system comprising:

(a) a search engine {See SMITH, page 3, subsection D, wherein this reads over "[t]he query is communicated to the VisualSEEK server on the World Wide Web through the Common Gateway Interface (CGI). The server answers the user's query by accessing the extracted meta-data that describes the images and videos in the archive"};

(b) an image analyzer coupled to said search engine, said image analyzer for comparing first and second images provided thereto from said search engine {See SMITH, page 1, section II, wherein this reads over "color indexing by localized or regional color provides for partial or sub-image matching between images"}, wherein:

the first image is associated with a first code {See SMITH, page 2, subsection B, wherein this reads over "[o]nce the image regions are identified, each region is characterized and represented using a feature set"; and page 3, subsection B, wherein this reads over "[a] color histogram is a high-dimensional feature vector typically having greater than 100 dimensions and the comparison of histograms is computationally intensive"} associated with a first predetermined textual annotation {See STUBLER, C6:L31-36, wherein this reads over "region metadata that is objectively derived from a region in the image"},

the second image is associated with a second code {See SMITH, page 2, subsection B, wherein this reads over "[o]nce the image regions are identified, each region is characterized and represented using a feature set"; and page 3, subsection B, wherein this reads over "[a] color histogram is a high-dimensional feature vector typically having greater than 100 dimensions and the comparison of histograms is computationally intensive"} associated with a second predetermined textual annotation {See STUBLER, C6:L31-36, wherein this reads over "region metadata that is objectively derived from a region in the image"},

the first code is descriptive of at least a region of the first image {See SMITH, page 4, subsection A, wherein this reads over "[a] color histogram denotes the joint probabilities of the intensities of the three color channels"},

the second code is descriptive of at least a region of the second image {See SMITH, page 4, subsection A, wherein this reads over "[a] color histogram denotes the joint probabilities of the intensities of the three color channels"}, and

the image analyzer uses image analysis of the first and second images along with a comparison of the first and second codes in determining if the first and second images are likely to compare favorably {See SMITH, page 10, wherein

this reads over "[t]he color histogram intersection was proposed for color image retrieval" and "[c]olors not present in the user's query image do not contribute to the intersection").

While SMITH may fail to expressly disclose a method wherein code is associated with a first predetermined textual annotation, STUBLER discloses a method wherein metadata is associated with regions of an image. Furthermore, wherein SMITH is directed to a method of indexing images for subsequent retrieval via searching, STUBLER discloses a method for associating semantic information with images in an image database environment for subsequent retrieval as well. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above invention suggested by SMITH with the invention as disclosed by STUBLER.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this modification so that the predetermined textual annotations may be used in the retrieval and comparison of images.

10. **As per dependent claims 2 and 24**, SMITH, in combination with STUBLER, discloses:

The system of claim 1 further comprising an input system coupled to one of said search engine and said image analyzer, said input system comprising at least one of:

- a graphical user interface {See SMITH, Figure 3};
- a facsimile system;
- a camera system;
- a scanner;
- a network connection; and
- a video system.

11. **As per dependent claim 3**, SMITH, in combination with STUBLER, discloses:

The system of claim 21 wherein the matching algorithm defines at least one particular region of an image and at least one particular measurement to make on pixels within each of the at least one particular image region {See SMITH, page 4, subsection A, wherein this reads over "[t]he color histogram is computed by discerning the colors within the image and counting the number of pixels of each color"}.

12. **As per dependent claim 4**, SMITH, in combination with STUBLER, discloses:

The system of claim 3 wherein the matching algorithm defines at least one measurement to make on one or more pixels in an image region neighboring the one particular

image region {See SMITH, page 8, subsection E, wherein this reads over "[f]or each of the regions the generative color set c is recorded and the region area and location are measured"}.

13. **As per dependent claims 5 and 23, SMITH, in combination with STUBLER, discloses:**

The system of claim 1 further comprising a storage device having at least one image stored therein coupled to at least one of said search engine, and said image analyzer {See SMITH, Figure 2}.

14. **As per dependent claim 21, SMITH, in combination with STUBLER, discloses:**

The system of Claim 1 wherein said image analyzer is provided information specific to a particular application to modify a matching algorithm used in determining if the first and second images compare favorably {See STUBLER, C3:L20-31}.

15. **As per dependent claim 36, SMITH, in combination with STUBLER, discloses:**

The system of Claim 1, wherein the search algorithm is automatically tailored to a subset of possible image factors that can be automatically analyzed, whereby the image analyzer automatically learns which factors are important in matching images {See STUBLER, C3:L20-31}.

16. **As per dependent claim 37, SMITH, in combination with STUBLER, discloses:**

The system of Claim 1, wherein:

the second image is part of a plurality of images, which are associated with a plurality of codes {See STUBLER, C6:L31-67,

the image analyzer compares the first code and the plurality of codes to find a subset of the plurality of images that compare favorably, wherein the second image is part of the subset {See STUBLER, C8:L18-39}.

17. **As per dependent claim 38, SMITH, in combination with STUBLER, discloses:**

The system of Claim 1 wherein at least one of the first and second predetermined textual annotations is human determined {See STUBLER, C5:L52-63}.

18. **As per dependent claim 39, SMITH, in combination with STUBLER, discloses:**

The image processing system for processing images stored on the network as recited in claim 22, wherein the first code is textual and derived with manual determination {See STUBLER, C5:L52-63}.

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

20. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Kim whose telephone number is (571) 272-2737. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on (571) 272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/767,216
Art Unit: 2161

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Paul Kim
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161
TECH Center 2100



ETIENNE LEROUX
PATENT EXAMINER